[29th January 1929

(*b*) & (*c*) Do not arise.

(*d*) The answer is in the negative.

(*e*) This does not arise.

(*f*) The Government have no reason to think that there is dissatisfaction, despair and indiscipline in the service.

Issue of the rule of "Communal rotation in the Registration department."

* 1112-E Q.—Mr. K. R. Karant: Will the hon. the Minister for Public Health be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether the rule of "communal rotation" was issued by the Inspector-General of Registration in consultation with him (the Minister);

(*b*) whether the rule was a decision of the entire Cabinet or only of the Minister or of the Transferred Half or of the Governor acting with the Ministers; and

(*c*) what is the advice tendered by the Minister to His Excellency the Governor on the matter?

A.—(*a*), (*b*) & (*c*) The Government Order referred to was issued by the Government.

Promotion of sub-registrars to the selection grade.

* 1112-F Q.—Mr. K. R. Venkatarama Ayyar: Will the hon. the Minister for Public Health be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether about thirty sub-registrars have been promoted recently to the selection grade;

(*b*) how many of those so promoted satisfy the test of seniority;

(*c*) how many senior sub-registrars have been superseded by juniors being promoted over them, and on what grounds they have been superseded;

(*d*) whether at the time of these promotions to the selection grade there were about thirty joint sub-registrars attached to District Registrars' offices assisting the District Registrars in their administrative work in addition to the discharge of their duty as sub-registrars, and whether they had been selected for their posts as such joint sub-registrars on grounds of their seniority and approved merit; and

(*e*) how many of such joint sub-registrars have now been superseded by junior sub-registrars being promoted over them and why they have been superseded?

A.—(*a*) Yes.

(*b*) & (*c*) The selection was made with reference to seniority, efficiency and community. Persons who were considered unfit have been superseded.

(*d*) Yes.

(*e*) There have been no supersession.

Corporation

Nomination of Mr. O. Thanikachalam Chettiyar to the Madras Corporation.

* 1113-A Q.—Mr. P. Bhakthavatsulu Nayudu: Will the hon. the Minister for Education and Local Self-Government be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether it is a fact that the term of Diwan Bahadur O. Thanikachalam Chettiyar ceases as a nominated member of the Madras Corporation; if so, when;

29th January 1929]

(*b*) whether the Government propose to re-nominate the same gentleman and if so, why;

(*c*) whether the Government are aware of the public criticism in the press and platforms in Madras when he was nominated soon after his defeat in the open election; and

(*d*) whether Government propose to consider the claims of the minority classes in filling up this vacancy?

A.—(*a*) & (*b*) The term of M.R.Ry. Diwan Bahadur O. Thanikachalam Chettiyar as nominated member of the Madras Corporation expired on 24th November 1928 and Government have in the interests of the municipal administration re-nominated him.

(*c*) Yes, but the relevance of such criticism to this gentleman's re-nomination three years later is not apparent.

(*d*) Does not arise, the vacancy having already been filled.

Nomination of Mr. O. Thanickachalam Chettiyar to the Madras Corporation.

* 1113-B *Q.*—Mr. C. N. MUTHURANGA MUDALIYAR: Will the hon. the Minister for Education and Local Self-Government be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether it is a fact that Mr. O. Thanikachalam Chettiyar has been nominated again as a member of the Madras Corporation;

(*b*) whether the Government are aware of the public criticisms levelled against the nomination of Mr. O. Thanikachalam Chettiyar last time; and

(*c*) why the claims of members of the Viswakarma community in the city were ignored in the matter of the present nomination?

A.—(*a*) & (*b*) The attention of the hon. Member is invited to the answer given to question No. 1113-A.

(*c*) It was considered that the nomination of Diwan Bahadur Thanikachalam Chettiyar was in the public interest.

Nomination of Mr. O. Thanikachalam Chettiyar to the Madras Corporation.

* 1113-C *Q.*—Mr. S. SATYAMURTI: Will the hon. the Minister for Education and Local Self-Government be pleased to state—

(*a*) the reasons why he nominated Diwan Bahadur O. Thanikachalam Chettiyar to the Council of the Madras Corporation;

(*b*) whether the Government are aware that Mr. Thanikachalam Chettiyar stood for election in 1925 and was defeated; and

(*c*) whether the Minister has any policy with regard to the nomination of defeated candidates to elective bodies, and, if so, what that policy is?

A.—(*a*) The attention of the hon. Member is invited to the answer to question No. 1113-A.

(*b*) Yes.

(*c*) The policy is to nominate candidates defeated at elections only in exceptional cases. The same objection does not apply to re-nominations.